REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-18, 20-26, 28, 30-32, and 34-39 have been

canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 40-43 have been added, which are

supported by *at least* paragraphs [45], [60]-[63], [80], and [81] of the Specification.

Accordingly, claims 40-43 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, 20-26, 28, 30-32, 34-36, 38, and 39 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson (U.S. Patent No. 6,957,075) in

view of Zancho (U.S. Patent No. 5,814,798). Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson in view of Zancho, and further in view of

Nakajima (U.S. Patent No. 7,095,456). Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly

being unpatentable over Iverson in view of Zancho, and further in view of Miller *et al.* (U.S.

Pub. No. 2003/0046557, hereinafter "Miller").

Applicants do not acquiesce to these rejections. Since these claims have been canceled,

however, the rejections thereto are rendered moot.

New Claims

New claims 40-44 are patentable because the prior art of record *at least* does not teach

selecting all the determined input/output module identification information relevant to the

received user based identification information among the plurality of the stored input/output

module identification information, identifying relative priority level of a plurality of the selected

input/output module identification information, determining whether input/output modules

corresponding to the selected input/output module identification information are available based on the identified priority level, and executing the determined available input/output module with the highest priority level among all available input/output modules, as set forth in some variation in independent claims 40 and 42.

For example, in claims 40 and 42, the determined available input/output module <u>with the highest priority level</u> among all <u>available</u> input/output modules is executed. In other words, a plurality of input/output modules are <u>available</u> for selection, and a particular input/output module is selected based on <u>priority</u>. On the other hand, a plurality of preferences are <u>not available</u> for selection in Zancho. In fact, the Examiner acknowledges that default or predicted preferences are assigned to an application device when the "preferences are <u>unavailable or unacceptable</u>", (Zancho, col. 8, lines 28-52, and col. 10, lines 48-51, and Office Action dated January 15, 2010, page 36, second full paragraph, emphasis added). Therefore, Zancho does not teach *at least* the feature of "executing the determined available input/output module with the highest priority level among all available input/output modules". Iverson also does not cure the deficient teachings of Zancho in this regard.

Accordingly, claims 40 and 42 are patentable over the combined teachings of Zancho and Iverson.

Claims 41 and 43 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   S. Stuart Lee
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 61,124
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 15, 2010